

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>JJ RODS LLC,</b>	:	<b>Case No. 2:23-cv-3052</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	:	<b>Chief Judge Algenon L. Marbley</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>Magistrate Judge Chelsey M. Vascura</b>
	:	
<b>RYAN HORCHEN, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants.</b>	:	

**ORDER**


This matter is before this Court on Plaintiff JJ Rods LLC’s Motion for Attorney’s Fees (ECF No. 16). Plaintiff sought a default judgment against Ryan Horchen and H & H Performance, Inc. (“Defendants”) (ECF No. 10), which this Court granted (ECF No. 14). In so granting, this Court ordered Plaintiff to file a motion for attorney’s fees and costs. Plaintiff filed such a motion (ECF No. 16), but this Court requested additional information regarding counsel’s fees and costs, including counsel’s hours worked, the appropriate hourly rate, and support that the combination of these two factors is reasonable in light of this case. (ECF No. 17).

Plaintiff has now provided the requested information to support its request for \$10,213.50 in fees and costs. Specifically, Plaintiff’s counsel supports their hours worked with detailed time logs with time entries from each of the five attorneys who worked on this case (ECF No. 18-1, Ex. A) and supports their requested hourly rate with data from the most recent Ohio State Bar Association survey (ECF No. 18 at 3–4; ECF No. 18-1 at 3). As to the tasks underlying counsels’ hours worked (23.40 hours in total), “a reasonable attorney would have believed the work to be reasonably expended in pursuit of success at the point in time when the work was performed.” *Wooldridge v. Marlene Indus. Corp.*, 898 F.2d 1169, 1177 (6th Cir. 1990), *abrogated on other*

*grounds by Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home, Inc. v. W. Va. Dep't of Health & Human Resources*, 532 U.S. 598 (2001). And the rates requested for such work (\$305–370 per hour for associates and \$475–620 per hour for partners) are reasonable, as they are in line with those in the Columbus market for firms of their size and attorneys at their level per the state bar survey. *See B & G Mining, Inc. v. Dir., Office of Workers' Comp. Programs*, 522 F.3d 657, 664 (6th Cir. 2008); *Geier v. Sundquist*, 372 F.3d 784, 791 (6th Cir. 2004).

Defendants have not opposed the Plaintiff's Motion, and the time for doing so has now passed. Because Plaintiff's requested fees and costs are reasonable, Plaintiff's Motion (ECF No. 16) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff is hereby awarded **\$10,213.50<sup>1</sup>** in fees and costs.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**ALGENON L. MARBLEY**  
**CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**DATED: September 10, 2024**

---

<sup>1</sup> See ECF No. 18-1, Ex. A for the calculation.